DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 277 224 FL 016 153

AUTHOR Loman, Bengt
TITLE The Segmentation Problem in the Study of Impromptu Speech.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 27p.; In: Enkvist, Nils Erik, Ed. Impromptu Speech: A Symposium. Papers Contributed to a Symposium on Problems in the Linguistic Study of Impromptu Speech (Abo, Finland, November 20-22, 1981); see FL 016 148.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Black Dialects; Coherence; Connected Discourse; Dialects; *Discourse Analysis; Language Research; Linguistic Theory; *Oral Language; *Research Methodology; *Sentence Structure; *Speech Acts; *Spontaneous Behavior; Structural Analysis (Linguistics); Surface Structure
IDENTIFIERS Segmentation (Verbal); *Spontaneous Speech

ABSTRACT

A fundamental problem in the study of spontaneous speech is how to segment it for analysis. The segments should be relevant for the study of linguistic structures, speech planning, speech production, or communication strategies. Operational rules for segmentation should consider a wide variety of criteria and be hierarchically ordered. This is particularly important for analysis of a large corpus of data, in which comparison of multiple analyses is important. Analysis of several Black English texts from one geographic area suggests a framework for segmentation into either phonological phrases or macrosyntagms, the latter of which can also be divided into two or more sentence units. Further, sequences of one or more sentences dominated by an intonation superfix may be regarded as speech-act units that manifest special speech-act functions in the speech situation. This approach is based on the idea that the superficial cohesion of discourse, which reflects an underlying coherence, is structurally manifested in the interaction between prosodic units, macrosyntagms, and speech acts. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED277224

THE SEGMENTATION PROBLEM IN THE STUDY OF IMPROMPTU SPEECH

Bengt Loman
Abo Akademi

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

■ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

□ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ENKVIST

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL 016 153

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Bengt Loman
Åbo Akademi

The segmentation problem in the study of impromptu speech

Abstract: A fundamental problem in the study of spontaneous speech is how to discover and cut off segments that are relevant with respect to the study of linguistic structures or speech planning or speech production or communication strategies. For an adequate analysis all sorts of criteria have to be considered, and (ideally) be included in a set of operational rules, if possible arranged in a hierarchical order. Particularly, such a procedure has to be worked out and followed if a large corpus has to be analyzed, for instance, by a research group, to make it possible to compare the results from various analyses.

We have to consider features from various levels in text analysis: prosodic features, syntactic features and speech act functions. If all such data are added to a word-by-word transcription, then it would be possible to make a detailed study of the functions of various boundary markers in the flow of speech, and also to study to what extent these markers are coordinated. In this short presentation I will particularly stress the need of such transcriptions. For me this is of course more important than my own small effort to apply a simple analytical model to a short text extract (as I have done in my paper at this conference).

1

Anyone who has tried to analyze sequences of impromptu speech knows the difficulties one meets with in the very first steps of the analysis, namely in the segmentation of the text into relevant units and the subsequent classification of these units. Part of the difficulty is caused by the fact that, as a rule, spoken texts are characterized by all sorts of irregularities and inadequacies. They are seldom available in complete transcription including those prosodic and paralinguistic features that are needed for a full understanding of relevant syntactic, semantic and contextual coherence. Another difficulty lies in the fact that various sets of criteria can be applied to the texts in the segmentation procedure, very often giving different results. Sometimes the analysis is made more or less intuitively, the analyst being neither fully aware of his criteria nor completely consistent in his handling of them.

My own impression is that it is difficult to come to an absolute, final solution, in the sense of a single one-dimensional segmentation of a spoken text. We have to consider various levels of analysis based on various sets of criteria. The results depend ultimately on the purpose of the analysis, e.g. whether it is to show the speaker's ability to produce long well-formed syntactic structures, or his manner of planning his speech in phrases interrupted by pauses and hesitation sounds, or his strategies in speech interaction with other persons.

In the flow of speech we may discover and react to various boundary markers. Only through a careful analysis will we be able to detect their varying functions and the interplay of various markers. In this article I will present some obvious sets of criteria for the segmentation of impromptu speech. Then I will show how the use of various criteria may give different results. Finally I will try to describe the functions of various boundary markers and discuss their places in a hierarchical structure.

While working on the subject I have read with interest a short but elucidating article by Nils Erik Enkvist and Hans Nordström, "On Textual Aspects of Intonation in Finland-Swedish Newscasts" (Studia Linguistica XXXII, 1978). In this work intonational phenomena have been studied in read texts and from the listeners' point-of-view. Can a listener judge whether a fragment belongs to the initial, middle or final part of a text unit? Is prosody a relevant feature in this context? The study has given some positive results which indicate that intonation patterns should be regarded as an important feature also in discourse analysis and text linguistics.

In contrast to Enkvist and Nordström I will base my own article on specimens of impromptu speech, and my starting-point is a linguistic analysis of the texts. At a later stage my preliminary results may be supplemented with data from perception tests. Theoretically and methodologically I have been particularly influenced by a book which was published in 1958 as an exponent of the classical American structuralist tradition. I am referring to Archibald A. Hill's *Introduction to Linguistic Structures*, which is far more original and advanced than its modest title might suggest. Of particular importance for the present study is Hill's demonstration of how intonation morphemes may be combined, through "phonological linking", into larger constructions with boundaries wider than the single phrase. For my transcriptions I have also used the same notation system as Hill, based on the familiar

Trager & Smith model. This model seems to be quite adequate for a prosodic analysis of the dialect represented in my examples, the Negro American dialect of Washington, D.C.

As demonstration material I have taken short extracts from a conversation which was recorded in October 1966 in a small one-family home, located in a central low-income area within Washington. The participants of the conversation are Michael Jones, a ten-year-old Negro boy; his mother Patricia; and Margy Gurney, a white research assistant. The recording has been published earlier in my book "Conversations in a Negro American Dialect" (Center for Applied Linguistics 1967), together with other recordings from the same time and place. The extracts have been taken from the beginning of the conversation. It starts directly with PJ rebuking her son (Text A). After that a short passage has been omitted. Here MG enters the conversation and asks MJ to tell her what he and his father talked about during an earlier recording session. After that Texts B and C follow in an uninterrupted sequence. PJ is the main speaker in Text A, MJ in B, and MG in C.

In the *Appendix* the texts are segmented into phonological phrases which are numbered. The appendix also contains additional data from an analysis of Text A:

I	:	phonological phrases 1 - 57
II	:	beginning of intonation superfix (▲)
III	:	sentence units
IV	:	terminal junctures
V	:	beginning of speech act unit

These categories will be explained in greater detail in the following discussion.

2

First of all, a text may be segmented into PHONOLOGICAL PHRASES. A phonological phrase consists of segmental material which is linked together by prosodic features: a stress pattern (including at least one instance of primary stress) and an intonation contour ended by a terminal juncture. There are three types of terminal juncture which have the following acoustic features in the relevant dialect:

The double-bar juncture / ‖ / is characterized by a short final rise in the fundamental frequency; this rise opposes the double-bar juncture to the two other types of terminal juncture.

The single-bar juncture / | / is characterized by sustained or increased intensity combined with sustained fundamental frequency.

The double-cross juncture /# / is characterized by absence of final intensity, while the fundamental frequency may be either sustained or, more often, lowered (changes in frequency, in this case, are always marked by numbers indicating pitch levels).

Terminal junctures have been marked in the position immediately before a pause. The juncture system is used to describe characteristic features in the articulation in this position. Occasionally, terminal junctures have also been marked in positions where there is no immediately following pause. This is the case when there is a significant shift in the speech tempo or in the sound quality, indicating that the speaker has made an intentional break in his utterance. Such boundaries have been marked by terminal juncture / | /. The same mark has been used to signal clear rhythmic boundaries within a phrase. If a syllable within a phrase is pronounced with the decreasing intensity (and the lowered frequency) that is characteristic of the double-cross juncture, this has also been marked (by /# /).

The terminal junctures /# / and / ‖ / normally occur at the end of sentences, while / | / normally occurs within sentences, dividing them into two or several phrases. For this reason /# / and / ‖ / may be regarded as final junctures, and / | / as a non-final juncture. A third category may also be considered in connection with the occurrence of glottal stops in phrase final position, cf. Text A, phrase 54 (A:54):

2 3
I'll see to you gettin' ahea'ʔ |

Glottal stops occur in final position in a number of complete sentences, as substitutions for stop consonants. The contrast between the terminal junctures /# / and / | / is neutralized if the phrase ends with a glottal stop. In this case, the phrase end always has the same character acoustically as the single-bar juncture, since the glottal stop cannot be combined with the decreasing intensity of the double-cross juncture. Phrase endings in glottal stops have

therefore to be classified as a special category. The juncture in these cases can be described as a final single-bar juncture (F/ | /).

The character of the glottal stop may illustrate how important it is that the phonological segmentation is consistent with relevant features in the sound system of the dialect concerned. This may also be shown by another example.

There is a practical problem in phonological segmentation (as described above): it is difficult to discover terminal junctures in positions where they are not immediately followed by a pause. It seems to be particularly difficult to find single-bar junctures in this position, and to persuade others of their existence. According to Hill, a phonological phrase may contain one single primary stress. This means that in an utterance there must always be a terminal juncture between two primary stresses. Hill has based his analysis on his own Midland dialect. In my analysis of the Washington Negro dialect I found it impossible to follow his principles in this respect. A single phrase was often found to contain several syllables with primary stress, which I found to be a characteristic feature of this dialect. A phonological phrase in this dialect may thus be described as a segment terminated by a terminal juncture and connected with at least one primary stress.

Some phonological segments terminated by a pause or a terminal juncture lack primary stress. For this reason they may be regarded as incomplete and thus not classified as phonological phrases in a strict sense. Phrases A:3, 12 and 36 are typical cases of such performance errors.

3

A segmentation based on purely syntactic criteria (without reference to prosody) is often indicated, particularly when transcriptions are incomplete and data on prosodic features are lacking. In such cases the segmentation procedure has to be based on some sort of intelligent reading of the text, with the purpose of discovering sequences which could be regarded as linked together through a network of syntactic relations. Such an operation is not unproblematic. Often various solutions seem to be possible and even well motivated. Examples of such ambiguities are easily found, e.g. in Text A. Should phrases 20-22 be regarded as two coordinated expressions forming one single fragment? or as two separate fragments? Should 27-30 and 31-32

be regarded as two separate questions (the second syntactically a fragment) – or as one single question? Also 44-49 and 50-52 are problematic.

In such cases it is practical to have a handy operational rule, to avoid inconsistencies in the analysis of a large corpus. A simple procedure would be to look for syntactic segments of a maximal extension. This means that connected sequences should be regarded as parts of one macrosegment – a MACROSYNTAGM – whenever syntactic relations could be assumed to exist between the parts. If it is possible to read a sequence of phonological phrases as belonging to one coherent sentence or sentence fragment, then this should be a relevant criterion for a segmentation on the purely syntactic level. Thus 20-22, 27-32, 44-49 and 50-52 should be regarded as four macrosyntagms. This is a method that has been used in the Swedish *Talsyntax* project, a study of syntactic structures in modern spoken Swedish.

On the other hand, if we also consider suprasegmental criteria, we may get a modified picture of the syntactic segments. As a matter of fact, very often it is necessary to apply suprasegmental criteria to the syntactic analysis. Features of stress, pitch and juncture may be necessary to decide whether a segment should be regarded as an interrupted or completed sentence, or whether a segment should be classified as a question or as a declarative sentence (cf. A:5) etc. But these prosodic features may also have a more direct influence on the results of the segmentation. Junctures / # / and / ‖ / are final, in the sense that they normally occur at the end of complete sentences. This observation could easily be formulated as a general rule for the segmentation procedure: all sentence units are not terminated by a final juncture, but a final juncture always marks the end of a (prosodic) sentence unit. Syntactically A:6-7 may be interpreted as one complex sentence fragment, consisting of two sentence structures. But phonologically the sequence may be regarded as two separate sentence structures, each terminated by a final juncture. With another intonation contour the segments might have been more closely linked together, e.g.:

2 3 2 32 2 2
about de way you're acting in school of lately | (p)

2 2 23
which is not very nice # (p)

However, this rule cannot be applied automatically. One also has to consider other syntactic realities, for instance whether a sentence in the deep structure may contain two or more conjoined sentences and thus be regarded as a compound sentence. This is an important issue which I have not been able to look deeper into at present. But special attention may well have to be paid to the position of the final terminal juncture, relative to the syntactic structure (as shown e.g. by a tree diagram). This means that, in some explicitly stated way, both phonological and syntactical criteria have to be integrated into one single analysis. A first, tentative segmentation based on purely segmental-syntactic criteria may be modified by phonological criteria, especially occurrences of terminal junctures. But then these phonological criteria have to be revaluated with regard to syntactic features in the internal structure of the sequence.

This suggests that two classificatory principles may come into conflict, but also that such conflicts should be solved through the introduction of an integrated set of criteria and segmentation rules. The results of this combined phonological and syntactical segmentation may be called SENTENCE UNITS. The sentence units are primarily various types of complete sentences: declarative sentences, special questions, general questions, and commands. Direct addresses, interjections and "fragments" have also been found necessary and sufficient for a segmentation of the text into contingent but not mutually overlapping sentence units.

A syntactic segmentation based on the occurrence of final terminal junctures may seem appropriate when applied to one particular type of text, but may lead to absurdities in other cases. The difference may be demonstrated by a comparison between Text A and Text C. Obviously the two speakers make use of different devices to link their phrases together into meaningful sequences. In PJ's speech, final terminal junctures are used as distinct markers at the end of sentence units. MG, on the contrary, makes abundant (and functionally rather meaningless) use of the double-cross juncture. But the staccato character of her utterance is compensated for by an effective use of pitch linking. In her utterances, consisting of extremely short phrases, intonation superfixes have a function similar to that of the terminal junctures in PJ's speech.

This leads us to another aspect of the segmentation problem.

4

Intonation contours consist of sequences of pitch levels. An intonation contour is terminated by a terminal juncture, and it therefore belongs to the phonological phrase. Phonological phrases can be linked together by means of the non-final single-bar juncture, and also by pitch linkage, even across a terminal juncture. Pitch linking occurs whenever the final pitch level of a phonological phrase is identical with the initial pitch level of the following phonological phrase. Thus phrases A:1-4 are linked together not only by the non-final terminal juncture / | / but also by an *intonation superfix*.

In column II the black triangles indicate the beginning of an intonation superfix. This superfix may start either at the beginning of a whole utterance or wherever there is an intonation break within an utterance, consisting of a pitch shift between two sentence units – across a final terminal juncture.

The intonation superfixes seem to be connected with those parts of a speech event which are called SPEECH-ACT UNITS, "acts such as making statements, giving commands, asking questions, making promises, and so on" (Searle). As is seen from column V it is fairly easy to attach a specific speech--act label to each segment dominated by an intonation superfix.

Similar results may be obtained by an analysis of Text B, where MJ talks about his earlier conversation with his father. Here B:1-3 constitutes one speech-act unit, where MJ presents the topic of the conversation. In 4-15 he relates the content of his father's answer. The concluding phrases 16-18 contain material which may be typical of utterance-final segments, repetitions of what has already been said and efforts to express the statements more clearly. The speaker is here filling a pause, he has nothing new to add, and he is waiting for the interlocutor to take over and react to his utterance. These paraphrases may be regarded as constituting two final speech acts (16 and 17-18).

A similar speech strategy may be observed in Text C. MG starts with three speech-act units (1, 2-3 and 4), each signaling attention. Unit 4 leads syntactically over to 5-9, where MG tries to establish contact with the interlocutor. In 10-16 she suggests a topic. This topic is specified in two final speech units, which have the function of activating MJ (17 and 18). His reaction finally comes in speech act 19.

So it seems that intonation superfixes have a double function in speech. They serve as markers of syntactic boundaries (together with the terminal junctures), but also as signals to the listener that he has to react differently to various parts of an utterance. The beginning of a new superfix means that the listener must be ready to make a shift in his basic attitude towards the speech segments. "You've just got a piece of information – but now you must be prepared that something different might follow, a command or a suggestion or a conclusion . . ."

5

In this sketch I have tried to outline various levels for the segmentation of utterances in impromptu speech. To summarize:

a. An utterance may be segmented into PHONOLOGICAL PHRASES, characterized by a terminal juncture and a stress pattern with at least one item with primary stress.

b. An utterance may also be segmented into MACROSYNTAGMS on the basis of an intelligent reading of the text with the purpose of discovering potential maximal sequences which are linked together by networks of syntactic relations.

c. The segmentation into macrosyntagms may be modified by means of phonological criteria. A macrosyntagm may be divided into two or several SENTENCE UNITS, each terminated by a final terminal juncture. This operation must, however, be counterbalanced with regard to particular features in the hierarchical internal structure of the macrosyntagm.

d. A sequence of sentence units may be linked together by means of an intonation superfix, characterized by an initial pitch shift (contrasting with the final pitch level of immediately preceding segment). Of course, also a single sentence unit may be dominated by an intonation superfix. Sequences that are dominated by an intonation superfix may be regarded as SPEECH-ACT UNITS, to the extent that they manifest special speech-act functions in the speech situation.

I want to stress that I regard this model as highly tentative and hypothetical. It is based on observations from a particular dialect. Therefore it is difficult

to make any assumptions of its general significance. I would rather like to see it as a model for further empirical investigations of authentic texts. If various features are considered in the context of prosody, syntax and speech-act functions, then it would be possible to make a detailed study of the functions of various boundary markers in the flow of speech, and also to study to what extent these markers are coordinated, in texts representing various speakers, styles, languages and language varieties. Probably a computational analysis will be needed.

In an analysis of impromptu speech there is always a risk that the analyst becomes a victim of self-illusion: that he hopes to find what he is looking for and that he interprets his acoustic material more or less according to his expectations. This is a dangerous temptation, especially as it is often very difficult to classify prosodic elements in actual spontaneous speech by a given, uniform yardstick. For instance, the four pitch levels have no absolute values, only relative ones, and in reality the "levels" might look more or less like a diffuse continuum. The problem of levels can best be tackled in experimental situations where minimal contrasts help to reveal basic "-emic" patterns. A prosodic analysis of spontaneous speech must thus be based on an effort to discover the underlying phonemic system of stress and intonation.

The results of my comparison between intonation superfixes on the prosodic level and speech-act units on the semantic level may raise a suspicion: is this too good to be true? In order to justify myself I want to stress that originally my transcriptions were made in order to explore intonation patterns within the sentence unit. At that time (1967) I did not know anything about text linguistics or speech-act analysis. This makes me even more curious about the possibilities to use the texts for a more comprehensive study of the role of intonation in speech-act units and discourse analysis.

Finally, I would even go so far as to say that texts which show a structure that in many ways seem to go against the scheme presented above are not necessarily to be seen as counterexamples to the scheme as a whole. Even at discourse level we have to retain a distinction between "pragmatic competence" and "pragmatic performance". Our pragmatic competence dictates the norms we attempt to follow in conversation, or in a narrative. It is the yardstick against which we can evaluate and compare the actually occurring verbal output. Speakers' performances may be influenced by such non-linguistic aspects as nervousness, pure speech defects, or even a heavy

consumption of alcohol. The scheme presented above seeks patterns of structure in the same way as the ethnomethodological approach: texts and discourses are presumed to have a superficial cohesion, reflecting an underlying coherence. This cohesion, I claim, is structurally manifested in the interaction between prosodic units, macrosyntagms, and speech acts.

APPENDIX

Extracts from a conversation recorded 20 October 1966, Washington, D.C.

Speakers; Patricia Jones, Michael Jones, Margy Gurney.

Abbreviations:

DS = declarative sentence
GQ = general question
SQ = special question
C = command
DA = direct address
I = interjection
F = fragment

Text A

PJ 1. well

you know what

Michael | (p)

2. I'm not tryin' to cut you acro' |

3. cu- |

4. cut across you # (p)

5. but you know a good thing for us to talk abou'

right before the presence of doctor Lomans

an' Margy # (p)

Analysis of Text A

I : phonological phrases 1 - 57
II : beginning of intonation superfix (▲)
III : sentence unit
IV : terminal juncture
V : beginning of speech act unit (a - ö)

	I	II	III	IV	V	
PJ	1	▲	I		a	(rhetorical) question: hinting at a topic
			GQ			
			DA	|		
	2		DS	|		
	3		"	|		
	4		"	#		
	5		GQ			

#

```
        2          3   2                    32      2   1
 6.  about de way you're acting in school of lately # (p)

          2        2        23
 7.  which is not very nice # (p)

        2              3    2            2    2 3    21
 8.  an' maybe in some way they can help me an' you # (p)

         2      31
 9.  how's tha' # (p)

         2
10.  well

           3   2      3   2                   3  1
     s'pose I let you tell them what has happened # (p)

         3 1   1
11.  recently # (p)

           1  2  1
12.  that I disl- |

        3  2  1
13.  I dislike # (p)

        2        3  2   3   2
MJ 14.  I been talkin' out of |  (p)

          3   2        32
15.  class a(t) schoo' # (p)

        3  2   32
16.  ac'in' up # (p)

        2        3                      3  34
PJ 17.  an' did I teach you how to do tha # (p)

         2
MJ 18.  no

        32
        mam # (p)

          4       3  2           21
PJ 19.  what did I teach you to do # (p)
```

	I	II	III	IV	V	
PJ	6	▲	F	#	b	answer: suggesting a topic
	7	▲	F	#	c	comment on topic
	8	▲	DS	#	d	reference to other participants
	9	▲	SQ	#	e	question
	10	▲	I		f	invitation to talk
			C	#		
	11	▲	F	#	g	additions to f
	12		F	|		
	13		"	#		
MJ	14	▲	DS	|	h	answer
	15		"	#		
	16	▲	F	#	i	answer completed
PJ	17	▲	GQ	#	j	question
MJ	18	▲	I		k	answer
			DA	#		
PJ	19	▲	SQ	#	l	question

MJ 20. to sit on my | (p)

21. sea' # (p)

22. an" don' say a word until the teacher tell me # (p)

PJ 23. an' you fail(ed) to do tha' |

24. righ' # (p)

MJ 25. yes

mam # (p)

PJ 26. well # (p)

27. don't you think i' be a good idea for | (p)

28. us |

29. to sit down an' talk this over wi' Marg'

an' maybe she'll give us some o' her |

30. ideas abou' dis some other time || (p)

31. as to | (p)

32. whether you shou be doing these things or not || (p)

	I	II	III	IV	V	
MJ	20	▲	F	|	m	answer
	21		"	#		
	22	▲	F	#	n	answer completed
PJ	23	▲	DS	|	o	question
	24		I(GQ)	#		
MJ	25	▲	I		p	answer
			DA	#		
PJ	26	▲	I	#	q	connexion
	27	▲	GQ	|	r	question
	28		"	|		
	29		"			
				|		
	30		"	||		
	31		F(GQ)	|	(r)	
	32		"	||		

MJ 33. yes

mam # (p)

PJ 34. because I don' think the teacher will like you very much longer |

35. if you gonna continue to do this # (p)

36. an' what's | (p)

37. wha's so bad abou' dis |

38. is the reason | (p)

39. I have to go to school an' then when I go I have to hear something that's very disagreeable about you instead of something pleasan' # (p)

40. how do you think that makes me feel # (p)

41. how do you think that makes me feel when I have to hear something unpleasan' when I | (p)

42. firs' meet your teacher # (p)

MJ 43. ba # (p)

	I	II	III	IV	V	
MJ	33	▲	I		s	answer
			DA	#		
PJ	34	▲	DS		t	argument
				|		
	35		"			
	36		DS	|		
	37		"	|		
	38		"	|		
	39		"			
				#		
	40	▲	SQ	#	u	question
	41	▲	SQ		v	question expanded
				|		
	42		"	#		
	43	▲	SF	#	w	answer

PJ 44. yes

it is bad an' i's most embarrasing || (p)

45. because | (p)

46. after I have to work all day long # (p)

47. an' come home at night an' then try to teach you

righ' from wrong # (p)

48. then you let me down # (p)

49. an' makes me feel terrible # (p)

50. in no future I would like for you very much

to try to better your conditions # (p)

51. an' see if you can't become a better chil'

in school # (p)

52. an' do as you are told # (p)

53. an' I'a promise you # (p)

54. I'll see to you gettin' ahea? | (p)

55. an' if you like to change the subjec' |

56. you can # (p)

MJ 57. yes

nam # (p)

	I	II	III	IV	V	
PJ	44	▲	I		x	argument
			DS	‖		
	45		"	|		
	46		"	#		
	47		"			
				#		
	48	▲	"	#	y	argument continued
	49	▲	"	#	z	argument completed
	50	▲	DS		å	conclusion
				#		
	51		F/C			
				#		
	52		F/C	#		
	53		DS	#		
	54		"	?|		
	55	▲	DS	|	ä	invitation to change of topic
	56		"	#		
MJ	57	▲	I		ö	reaction
			DA	#		

Text B

MJ 1. 22
yeah #(p)

2. 2 2 2 2
I as' him all abou' | (p)

3. 2 2 2
what he do at work #

4. 2 3 2
he tells me #(p)

5. 2 3 2
an' I as' 'im #(p)

6. 2 3 2 2
how do dey git paid I said #(p)

7. [a: #](p)

8. (...) (p)

9. 2 3 2 2
an' how do dey |

10. 2 32
come home #(p)

11. 2 3
how do dey git off |

12. 2 32
from work #(p)

13. 2 3 2 3 2 3 2
he said that the man blow a whistle #(p)

14. 2
an' |

15. 3 3 2 3 3 2 3 2 3 1
he brang an' ne man brangs his money to 'im #(p)

16. 2 3 2 3 1
an' then blow the whistle #(p)

17. 2 3 2
an' da's wh-| (p)

18. 2 3 2 32
an' when he blow the whistle they (are)'off #(p)

Text C

MG 1. 3 2
okay #(p)

2. 32
now #(p)

3. 2
[a: #] (p)

4. 3
let's #(p)

5. 2 2
sort of #(p)

6. 2 32
think again and| (p)

7. 2
an' #(p)

8. 2
[a:m #](p)

9. 2 2
Michael| (p)

10. 3 32
think about #(p)

11. 2
what #(p)

12. 2 li-| (p)

13. 2 3 what you # (p)

14. 2 32 like most # (p)

15. 2 3 2 that Patricia makes # (p)

16. 2 21 at home # (p)

17. 21 food # (p)

18. 3 21 that you have # (p)

MJ 19. [3 2 o:w#] (p)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Enkvist, Nils Erik, and Hans Nordström. 1978. On textual aspects of intonation in Finland-Swedish newscasts. Studia Linguistica XXXII. 63-79.

Hill, Archibald A. 1958. Introduction to linguistic structures. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Joos, Martin. 1962. The definition of juncture and terminals. Second Texas conference on problems of linguistic analysis in English. 4-18. The University of Texas. Austin, Texas.

Loman, Bengt. 1967. Conversations in a Negro American Dialect. Washington, D.C. Center for Applied Linguistics.

– 1967. Intonation patterns in a Negro American Dialect. Washington, D.C. Center for Applied Linguistics. Unpublished manuscript.

Searle, John R. 1970. Speech acts. Cambridge University Press.

Smith, Henry Lee Jr. 1962. Syntactic analysis and a general theory of levels. Third Texas conference on problems of linguistic analysis in English. 86-107. The University of Texas. Austin, Texas.

Trager, George L., and Henry Lee Smith Jr. 1951. An outline of English structure. Studies in Linguistics. Occasional Papers 3.